THE MADRAS
Christian College Magazine.

VOL. XXVIII. JUNE, 1911. No. 12.

SEEING AND NOT SEEING *

Lord, I pray thee, open his eyes that he may see. And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man; and he saw: and, behold, the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha.

Lord, open the eyes of these men that they may see. And the Lord opened their eyes and they saw; and, behold, they were in the midst of Samaria.

2 KINGS vi. 17, 20.

ELISHA emerges successfully from a severe ordeal. He succeeds a great man, and he proves himself great. As he passes across the stage of Israel's history he impresses us by his strong personality, by his unflinching righteousness, by his loftiness of purpose, by his lack of fear, by his devoted patriotism, and withal by a genial attractiveness of spirit.

At the time we read of him in this chapter of the Book of Kings his whole energy is directed towards the deliverance of his king and people from the toils of the Syrians, the enemy that throughout all his days sought to humble Israel. The King of Syria, we are told, planned several ambushes for his foes. But as often as he did so, and however skilfully, he was surprised to find that the Israelites as skilfully evaded them. Clearly they had been forewarned. But how could this have been, save through some traitor in the Syrian camp? Such at least was the King of Syria's belief. But his subjects thought otherwise. No plan, they said, could escape the untiring scrutiny of Elisha. He was ever on the alert. His constant journeying among the schools of the prophets rendered him familiar with the whole country, with the defile that might prove a death trap for a foe, or the jungle where every bush could be a man. The careful plans of the King of Syria were but clumsy artifices to the keen-sighted and active-minded Elisha..

* A sermon preached in College Church.

Sooner or later the prophet knew that a price would be set upon his life; and when he trusted himself in Dothan—a town situated in the plain through which the well-marked caravan route to Egypt ran—he had to all appearance put his neck into the noose. What his servant discovered on rising the following morning was what the prophet had anticipated. But it was none the less terrifying. On the hills surrounding Dothan was posted a detachment of the hosts of the King of Syria. By hard riding through the night they had quietly encircled the town. Elisha was to all seeming already in their hands. 'Alas, my master,' cries the prophet's servant, in an outburst of grief, 'how shall we do?' Escape is impossible. The panic of the servant finds no response in the words or demeanour of Elisha. 'Look again at these hills,' he says to his faithful attendant. 'When first you looked you saw nothing but the troops of our enemy. But there are hosts on these hills which render puny the hosts of our opponents: and these hosts are for *us*. Look again and may the Lord open your eyes: and to the servant's eye the whole hillside is changed by the prophet's words. There is still the full complement of Syrian horsemen, but nearer and further than these, far as the eye of trust can reach, stretch the legions of God strong, benignant, invincible. The servant's eyes were opened: the lesson had been learnt: let the Syrians do their worst.

And so Elisha, with perfect fearlessness, goes out through one of the city gates. There he is met by some of the Syrian horsemen who have just come down to the plain from the surrounding heights. As soon as they see an inhabitant of Dothan, 'Where is Elisha?' they eagerly enquire. 'Follow me,' says the unrecognised prophet, 'and I will bring you to the man whom ye seek.' There is no further parley: they entrust themselves to his guidance, blinded to all ordinary precaution by their eagerness to secure their prey, blinded also by their delight in the thought that they will steal a march on their companions. They have but to follow this man and in a few hours Elisha will be in their hands. Then when they come back to their fellow-soldiers wandering non-plussed through the Israelitish town, they will be acknowledged as the heroes of the expedition—the far-seeing ones, who were

ready to put it to the test to win or lose it all. In happy blindness they follow their leader. They pass through unknown ways and without danger. Here at last is a town looming before them; they enter its gates, thread its bazaars; with beating hearts they have reached their goal. Then a word here, a look there, begins to perplex them; where are they being led? Only when they find themselves in the presence of the royal bodyguard is their question answered, the scales drop from their eyes. They are in Samaria, they have fallen into the trap; with eyes open yet blind they have delivered themselves up to the very man whom in their day dreams they imagined themselves bringing back in fetters. Their blindness is over, they see reality. But the men thus trapped, what is to become of them? 'Kill them' says the King. 'Nay, but send them back to their own King, unharmed,' counsels Elisha. The advice is taken, and the magnanimous action of the Israelite leaders does not fail of its effect. "The bands of Syria came no more into the land of Israel."

Seeing and not seeing—upon these thoughts this story concentrates our attention. The Lord opened the eyes of the devoted servant and lo! deliverance. The Lord opened the eyes of the self-confident soldiers and lo! captivity.

I

There is a price to pay for seeing. There may be sight without seeing. 'All these things,' says Augustine, speaking of facts which refuted the opinions he at one time held, 'all these things struck my eyes on every side but I did not see them.' I remember reading some eight years ago the story of a man who, at the age of thirty, had undergone a successful operation for congenital cataract. The description of his return from the Glasgow Ophthalmic Institution to his own home at Bridge of Weir was the joyous story of a man's entrance upon a new and unexplored realm. And yet for ten days after he could see, the patient could not realise that he was seeing. Pictures were 'mere masses of confused colour.' The pavement he believed could be touched out of a second story window by a short stick. The face of the house-surgeon was the first thing he actually perceived, but he came to this knowledge only after much thought, through rapid inference, and the constant exercise of an active mind. He had sight before he could see.

The true sight is insight. The ordinary man, says Plato, sees but he does not see. He sees only shadows, never the reality. He who has broken with the bondage to the flesh pierces though the lying and elusive and he rejoices in facts. The ordinary sculptor sees a block of marble and has no use for it. 'Give me that block' say Michael Angelo, 'I see an angel in it.' The children playing in the sand of Witwatersrand see in it but so much material for their play. The traveller passing by sees in it the sheen of gold, and the riches of the Transvaal. His contemporaries saw in Simon, the son of John, a capable if impulsive fisherman; Jesus saw in him a rock, and a rock He made him.

The flash of intuition that lights up the hidden secrets and lays bare with unmistakeable truth what others have passed by unobserved—that flash comes not without labour or pain. It has meant the dwelling among great thoughts and noble souls, it may have meant years of misrepresentation, and it is bound to mean hours of silent meditation and prayer. It is these that guide vision and transform sight into insight. Truly we were born to see, and in a world framed by the Father of Love what sights must be awaiting us. Do we see much and yet none of them? Then can it be that we will not pay the price? that we will not scorn delights and live laborious days? that we will not set our affection on things above? that we will love the garish day and allow ourselves to be ruled by pride?

II

But even if we are not willing to pay the price, *the sight may come to us and yet bring to us neither charm nor comfort.* The self-confident Syrians threw precaution to the winds, and on they went. And when in their first cool moment they opened their eyes, they who had thought themselves victors saw themselves victims, and instead of captors they were captives.

How many a day since then has the journey of the Syrian horsemen been repeated.

(1) Does not every student know the danger of study, just as he knows the danger of the lack of it? How, if it is pursued with undiscriminating attachment, it may yield him no outlook rich and fair? How it may condemn him to the drudgery of Browning's Grammarian without any of his magni-

ficent conception of life and its value? Has not Sir Oliver Lodge told us recently, with regret, how for a long time he despised poetry and its message, while the phenomena of the physical universe claimed the whole of his thought and investigation? And to what a Samaria may this lead. The eyes of some are opened, and behold they are in a world of wheeling atom and persistent force which grinds and tosses aside and passes on. And others see and lo! truth and goodness and beauty are gone, and they wander in darkness, the victims of circumstance.

(2) We form a friendship with as little caution as these old warriors. With less than common prudence we entrust ourselves to one whose strength or cleverness we admire. We share in the glory of the greater light, but we notice not, amidst the characteristics that attract us, those characteristics which may be a-wanting. There may be physical but not moral courage; there may be power of speech but also fatal facility of those words that stain the soul; there may be many an element of success, but no upward glance to the Giver of it. Notwithstanding this, we continue our friendship, and all goes well till one day comes, one test is applied. Our eyes are opened and we—we are in Samaria. We have not attained to our friend's physical powers but we have acquired only too surely his shifty nature. We have far less success to boast of, but we have succeeded, beyond all that we could have imagined, in quenching the still small voice of conscience. We threw prudence to the wind in entrusting ourselves to a friend, and now we see. The inevitable result has followed. The call of duty finds us cowards, the voice of conscience has lost its power, and then we are undone.

(3) May not habit, the decider of destinies, the chosen mode of upbuilding, lead us along the same path, if we use not our eyes in the following of it? Like the word thoughtlessly spoken amid Alpine heights that loosens the snow which onward sweeps till the avalanche is formed and villages are overwhelmed, so does the thoughtless act repeated become a habit and habit a fetter that chafes and impedes. It is not gross sensual habits alone that lead us to this dreadful Samaria. Take the more common but equally deadly habit of estimating the value of all things by the way in which they minister to ourselves. Every whim that gratifies us gladly accepted, every ambition that

glorifies us unhesitatingly fostered, till there is no star in the firmament so large as self; to deny self becomes the sheerest folly, to exalt self the highest wisdom. At length our eyes are opened and we see the Samaria into which we have fallen. The real zest of life has been pressed out of us. Appetites remain insistent without hope of gratification; applause palls; popularity decays; companionship ceases. Without joy, without hope, without rest—like the souls of desire in Dante's Inferno—such is the self that has ministered to none but itself. To this Samaria it has come.

To such Samarias may we come. But if we do not wish to see them, then must we be prepared to pay the price. And truly that price is not grievous. If we wish not to fall into Samaria then must we needs pass through Samaria, until we come to a well near to a parcel of ground which Jacob gave to his son. And from Him who sits by the well let us take the water of life which He so lovingly holds out. And as we take it, new life and new vision become ours. Life stretches out before us in ever widening vistas of attractiveness and hope. And the road that leads to the fatal Samaria we discern before we are there, and from it we flee as those whose pathway lies through fairer regions, and on to that city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.

III

If we are ready to pay the price, *our eyes will be opened and we shall look on sights inexpressible and full of wonder.* To the clarified vision of the servant, who had followed his master through good report and ill, there appeared a strength which was more than a match for Syria's greatest force.

The same sight opens itself out before him who, cost what it may, is determined not to rest till his eye can see the things that are invisible. And these are waiting: they are real.

(1) You long for friendship, eager not only to gain but also to give, ready to welcome the true and cast from you the false cherishing high thoughts of the worth and power of comradeship, You do not lower your standard though ofttimes tempted, you believe in it though cynics scorn. And yet for a long period, it may be, friendship seems but a round of conventions, and you might be stripped of all your circle without loss or pain. And then some

great sorrow comes into your life and the price you have been paying tells. And you see as never before. You stand dumb in the presence of the riches that are laid at your feet. Loyalty, service, regard which abash you. Friends who find it hard at ordinary times to say all that is in their heart, but who quietly, thoughtfully have all the time been upholding you, garrisoning you. What a wealth of generous unselfish strength girdles you round. You know it now; the mountains are full of chariots and horses, and life has received an added meaning and blessing.

(2) You have been taught to pray and to believe in prayer: but how useless it has sometimes seemed and how lifeless. You are tempted to abandon it all as vain repetition and form. But two things restrain you: your parents prayed and Jesus prayed. Your parents prayed and what a home of happy memory. Jesus prayed, prayed without ceasing, and what a matchless life was His. So with a tenacity that is almost blind you cling to prayer; in a need well-nigh overwhelming you throw yourself on God in prayer. And the answer comes, the price you have paid tells. Your eyes are opened and you are in a realm where you have power, limitless power, power with God and with man, and where you prevail. What force on earth is there to compare to this constraining power of humble, trusting, childlike prayer?

Father Benson tells us the story of a priest who was renowned for his constant activity in every religious and philanthropic work. In his ministrations he had to wait upon the nuns of a certain sisterhood, who gave themselves entirely to prayer. In his heart he despised their inactivity. Why should they not come forth into the world leaving their prayer, and work even as he did? Thinking thus he went into the chapel: a solitary nun was bent in devotion. And as she prayed, a vision burst upon the priest. Reaching up from that praying figure he beheld a road that ran right to the heart of God, and from that blessed heart another pathway of light along which streamed unnumbered blessings to men. The priest had had his eyes opened, and he rose ashamed. 'I had thought of these praying sisters as useless compared with me. I see it now. That nun is a Rothschild: I a petty shopkeeper'.

Round her, round you, round all that pray and do not faint

stand the chariots and horsemen of God and in the conflict with our foes they that are with *us* are more than they that are with *them*.

(3) You look upon Jesus: you are arrested by His words, by His sympathy, by His life. Is He not one of the Princes among men? Has he not His place by the side of the world's great teachers and examples? And then some saying of His haunts you: 'Follow me.' 'Come unto me.' 'He that believeth in me hath eternal life.' And you begin to follow; in the face of obstacle after obstacle you seek to obey Him. It is hard work but you will not be daunted. And the price of the daily cross which you pay tells. Your eyes are opened and you see Him as He is—holy, harmless, undefiled, separated from sinners: but not aloof from you. The marks of a crown of thorns and the print of nails which He has borne for you are upon Him. And all is glorified by the lustre of a full and endless life, which He spends —how? In making continual intercession for you, in pleading your cause at God's right hand, omnipotent to save. An eternal life spent not in being ministered unto but in ministering, yea in ministering unto you the riches of omnipotence. This is the most wondrous and the most real sight of all.

Open our eyes, O Lord, that we may see Jesus day by day, and hour by hour. Open our hearts, too, that we may love Him. Then will the dark mountains that surround us be lighted up by the Lord's horses and chariots of fire. Then shall we mount up with wings as eagles; we shall run and not be weary; and in His companionship, along the roughest and the steepest road, we shall walk and not faint.

WILLIAM MESTON.

RELIGIOUS TOLERATION.

AT the opening of Parliament in the beginning of this year King George had to make a solemn declaration that he is a Protestant. This was necessary in consequence of the provisions of the famous Bill of Rights, passed in 1689, which enacted that every monarch of England should, when he ascended the throne, make such a declaration either on the first day of the meeting of his first parliament or on the occasion of his coronation. The form of the declaration which the Bill of

Rights prescribed was that contained in the Parliamentary Test Act of 1678, but as the language of that declaration is such as to give needless offence to many of King George's subjects, a new form has been provided by the Act of Parliament passed last year. The new form, by which the King simply declares himself a Protestant, is a great improvement on the old, but the fact that a religious test is still attached to the highest office in the British Empire not unnaturally calls attention to the subject of religious toleration. The object of this paper is to consider shortly the nature of religious toleration, the history of its development in the West, and its limits.

Religious toleration, in its technical or special sense, is an expression which is descriptive of the attitude of the State towards differences of religious belief. It implies the existence of the State with its powers of coercion. A State in which there is religious toleration is one in which the State by means of its laws protects the individual in the exercise of his private judgment on matters of religion. It does not attempt by means of legislation and coercion to compel uniformity of religious belief or practice, and it refuses generally to allow a citizen to be penalised for holding or expressing any particular religious beliefs. The word 'intolerance' is no doubt often used of any kind of impatience with opposition, but in the technical sense with which we have to do at present it means having recourse to the coercive powers of the State in order to bring about the adoption of a particular religion by an individual, or to prevent the exercise by an individual of the religion of his choice.

Toleration is at the present day rather a popular virtue, possibly because its exercise generally means not doing something, and sometimes people are apt to identify it with indifference, which is, however, a totally different thing. That an individual is tolerant does not mean that he has no strong beliefs or opinions of his own, or that he holds that it does not matter what a man believes, or that he looks upon all religions as equally true, or, for the matter of that, as equally false. The tolerant man recognises the right of private judgment in matters of religion, the right of other individuals to hold religious opinions different from his own. He regards his fellowmen as rational beings who are responsible for their

beliefs and for the actions that are the outcome of their beliefs, and though he may feel strongly that his views are true and that it would be a good thing for the world if all men held his views, he will not attempt to force those who disagree with him to change. Persuasion he may employ, appeals to the emotions or to the reason, but not force. A man's religion, he considers, is not a proper subject for the coercive power of the State.

It should be noticed also that the words toleration, tolerant, intolerant, and the like, are often very loosely used when speaking of religious organisations. In the stricter sense such an organisation is intolerant only when it seeks the aid of the State, or of forces sanctioned by the State, to compel persons to join it or to prevent persons from leaving it. Intolerance moreover is sometimes confused with narrowness, and a religious body is sometimes accused of being intolerant because it refuses to permit persons who will not conform to its doctrines or practices to continue to be members of it. A religious organisation, however, whatever other and more important objects it may have in view, exists partly at least for the purpose of perpetuating itself and, it may be, of enlarging itself. To keep it together there must be some common bond. Usually the bond is one either of common ritual, or common belief, or both. Now it is natural that in the interests of its own self-preservation a society should refuse to retain within itself those who decline to be bound by the common bond. Such action cannot in itself be regarded as intolerance. It may in any particular case be ill-advised or even foolish, but a religious organisation, like any other society, has a right to protect itself. The judgments that should be passed on such actions should be determined by the grounds on which they are performed, and inevitably an organisation reveals its character by the nature of the grounds on which expulsion from its membership takes place.

Similarly too a religious organisation which seeks to enlarge itself is not on that account necessarily intolerant. Missionary religions are often accused of being intolerant. Sometimes for example the intolerance of Christianity is contrasted with the toleration of Hinduism. Now the Christian Church has, it is true, often shown itself extremely intolerant, but the mere fact that it aims at being the universal religion, that it claims to

possess the highest truth and regards it as its duty to teach that truth to others, does not make it intolerant. Nor on the other hand does the fact that Hinduism is—or was till recently—a local non-missionary religion, admission to which can be obtained only by birth, make it necessarily tolerant. If Christians use force to make converts to Christianity or if Hindus use force to prevent persons from becoming converts, they are alike intolerant, for both alike interfere with the exercise by the individual of his private judgment in the sphere of religion.

Turning now to the historical development of toleration we may notice generally that the idea of toleration is not one that naturally commends itself to men. In primitive societies real toleration cannot exist. Toleration implies, as we have seen, the recognition of the right of the individual to exercise his private judgment in the sphere of religion. In societies therefore where the rights of the individual are little if at all recognised, where the tribe or the family is everything and the individual is nothing, it is impossible for real toleration to be practised. Toleration of a kind no doubt may exist with regard to men outside the tribe. Recognising the existence of other tribes and of other tribal deities, the members of a tribe may consider it to be perfectly right for the members of other tribes to worship their own particular deities. Proselytism is not thought of, for the worshippers of each set of deities are regarded as co-extensive with the members of each tribe. But there is no toleration for the private beliefs of a member of the tribe if he differs from the tribal religion. He is regarded as a traitor to the ancestral gods and must be cut off lest the anger of the gods be incurred by the whole tribe.

As political integration took place and great empires arose which included within their bounds large numbers of different peoples, possessing different religions and worshipping different gods, a crude kind of toleration grew up. Its growth was facilitated by the existence of the belief in polytheism which rendered it easy to admit new gods to the national pantheon. Its development was assisted also by the tendency, sometimes known as syncretism, by which the gods of one people were identified with gods possessing similar characteristics found to be worshipped by other peoples. Thus, for example, the Syrian Astarte

was identified with the Greek Aphrodite and the Latin Venus. Further as by far the most important part of the ancient religions consisted in the performance of rites and ceremonies, speculation was permitted to be very free provided that it did not interfere with the due performance of the popular observances.

It was impossible, however, that in these ancient empires there could be real toleration. The conception of the national religion as an integral part of the organisation of the State forbade its full development. In theocratic or semi-theocratic States dissent from the national faith meant treason to the State. Rome is usually spoken of as having been tolerant, and with considerable reason, for Rome as a rule did not interfere with the religious beliefs and practices of the conquered peoples, save when they were regarded as dangerous to the State or as repulsive to common humanity. Frequently, however, attempts were made to prevent Romans from adopting "foreign superstitions," and the absence of real toleration was seen when the refusal of the early Christians to take part in the national religious ceremonies which they regarded as idolatrous was construed into disloyalty to the State and involved them in fiery persecution even at the hands of a Marcus Aurelius.

It might have been expected from the character of its Founder and the nature of His teaching that the Christian Church would all along have taught and practised toleration. The whole tenor of Christ's teaching ought to have shown His followers that they ought not to attempt to obtain spiritual ends by the use of physical force. But when Christianity became the recognised religion of the Roman Empire, it became the heir to many bad traditions, and amongst them was the belief that it was the duty of the civil power to enforce the State religion. There were various influences at work in the church itself which prepared the way for the acceptance of this evil legacy. First of all the simplicity of early Christianity had been overlaid by the development of ritual, and, next, faith, the personal trust of which the Apostles wrote, had been gradually transformed into meaning the formal assent of the intellect to certain dogmatic propositions. Now it is an interesting fact that intolerance and an external view of religion are often closely

connected. If a religious organisation lays great stress on the performance of ceremonies or on the formal acceptance of certain intellectual beliefs, if in its view these are the important things in religion, then it is more likely to seek the aid of the State or of forces sanctioned by the State to enforce uniformity of creed and ritual, to compel persons to join it, or to prevent persons from leaving it. The greater stress therefore which the Christian Church of the fourth century laid upon uniformity of worship and upon orthodoxy of belief prepared the way for its becoming a persecuting organisation. Also the imitation of imperial methods of government and the consequent development of the hierarchy still further tended to depress the rights of the individual and to exalt the authority of the church in all matters of faith and conduct.

The break-up of the Roman Empire produced no alteration in the Church's attitude on the subject of toleration. The German war-lords who developed into the kings of Western Europe usually found that their power was strengthened by an alliance with the Church. Much good no doubt resulted from this alliance but toleration was not dreamt of and the gradual growth of the power of the Papacy in Western Europe was, of course, an influence most adverse to the idea of the liberty of the individual in religious matters.

As time went on the Papacy aimed more and more at establishing a theocracy and was thus brought into conflict with the Empire, but even before the more extravagant claims of the Papacy were put forward, it was recognised that one of the chief duties of the Emperor was, as Bryce puts it, "at home to make the Christian people obedient to the priesthood and to execute priestly decrees upon heretics and sinners; abroad to propagate the faith among the heathen, not sparing to use carnal weapons." The very title "The Holy Roman Empire" testified to the union of Church and State. "The Holy Roman Church and The Holy Roman Empire are one and the same thing seen from different sides." And this union made it "the duty of the Civil Magistrate to root out heresy and schism no less than to punish treason and rebellion."

The development of the great nation States of Western Europe did not at first work any change, for even when their

monarchs might be on bad terms with the Pope they arely allowed themselves the pleasure of annoying him by encouraging heretics. And even when the Reformation came, and one country after another broke off more or less completely from the Church of Rome, the old idea still prevailed that it was the duty of a citizen to hold the faith of his country or it might be of his king. This last idea was carried to its fullest development in Germany where in the course of the religious wars the compromise was arrived at that the religion of the inhabitants of a State should be that of its ruler—"*cujus regio, ejus religio.*"

Protestantism being essentially of the nature of a revolt from the authority of the Church it might have been expected that Protestants would at once have recognised the right of the individual to exercise his private judgment in matters of religion. That, however, was far from being the case, for the old idea of the duty of the State to enforce uniformity in religion had borne sway too long over the minds of men to be quickly given up. The tendency towards absolute monarchy which characterised European history in the 16th and 17th centuries was inimical to the development of toleration, and even where Protestantism took the democratic Presbyterian form it tended to seek to establish a theocracy with the Bible as its legislative programme. Many Protestants when they were persecuted resented the persecution not because it was an act of intolerance but because it was the wrong persons that were being persecuted. Still toleration was implicit in the Protestant position, and as a rule the persecutions in which Protestants indulged were to a large extent the result of political considerations. The history of the persecution of Roman Catholics in England during the reign of Elizabeth shows this clearly. At first they were treated leniently, but as time went on and they became identified more and more with the enemies of the Queen the penal laws became more and more severe, and it was the struggle for national existence with Catholic Spain that developed the extreme anti-popery feeling which was so long characteristic of the English people.

In passing it may be noted that the adoption of intolerance as an essential characteristic of a religious organisation makes the practice of toleration by others more difficult. Apart

altogether from the feeling which makes some Protestants ask "Why should we tolerate Catholics when Catholics openly admit that if they had the power they would not tolerate us?" the question may not unnaturally be raised how far it is desirable to place those who hold that intolerance is right in a position that may enable them to carry their theory into practice. It is this feeling which underlies the constitutional demand for a declaration of the Protestantism of the King of England on the occasion of his accession. The King owes his throne, on the one hand, to the hereditary principle and, on the other, to the Protestantism of the people of England, and there is nothing intolerant in the people demanding that as by accepting the hereditary principle they have so far put the choice of their chief magistrate beyond their own control certain other conditions shall be complied with by him.

The spirit of toleration which is implicit in Protestantism gradually began to make its existence felt. The first faint glimmerings of toleration in England are seen in the middle of the 17th century amongst the Independents and some of the other sects that came into existence at that time. But how far men were from accepting toleration as a principle to guide the State in the treatment of its subjects may be seen from the fact that the famous Toleration Act, passed in the reign of William and Mary, affected only Protestant dissenters who held orthodox Christian views, and that even in their case all that was granted was modified liberty of worship while the civil disabilities that had been imposed upon them remained untouched. No doubt from the time of Walpole, Acts of Indemnity forgave the legal penalties incurred by dissenters who held office under the State, but it was not till the second quarter of the nineteenth century that the Test and Corporation Acts were repealed and that the Catholics also were freed from the burden of the penal laws. As England has been the most advanced and liberal of all European countries—with the exception of Holland—in this matter, it is plain that religious toleration has been a plant of slow growth; but now in most parts of Europe it has taken firm root, and even Russia has recently accepted the principle to some extent, in theory at least.

The development of the idea of religious toleration may be

ascribed chiefly to the growth of individualism and to a change in the conception of the duty of the State towards its subjects. Religious persecution might be defended either as being a good thing for the future welfare of the individuals persecuted or as being for the good of the State. When, however, it began to be thought that the individual might safely be left to look after himself so far as religion was concerned, and when it was found that men might be good citizens though they did not hold the creed of the majority of their fellow citizens, religious toleration began to appear.

We may ask in conclusion whether there are any limits to religious toleration. It is clear that the State must necessarily interfere to prevent actions from being done in the name of religion which it would certainly prevent or punish if done without any such excuse. An apocryphal anecdote attached to the name of Dr. Jowett well illustrates this position. It is said that when he was Master of Balliol a young Thug became an undergraduate of that distinguished college and caused extreme discomfort to those who passed near his rooms by indulging in the ritual associated with his peculiar creed. His conduct was reported to the Master who summoned the young enthusiast to his presence and told him that while he might hold what religion he pleased he must not incommode the staircase. Thus one limit to religious toleration is placed by the necessity of recognising the rights of others. The State, for example, should not permit murder, theft, indecency, or any form of vice or immorality which it punishes, to be practised with impunity because it shelters itself under the cloak of religion. Further the State cannot afford to permit the existence of sedition or of anything that threatens its own existence merely because it associates itself with some form of religion. Here no doubt great difficulty may arise in practice, but the principle may be accepted all the same.

The problem of religious toleration is really a particular case of the great problem of the relation of the individual to the State. Intolerance, as we have seen, has been due to the subordination of the individual conscience and to the exaltation of the State and of the religion with which it may have happened to be identified. Toleration has been due partly to the emancipation of the individual and partly to the state's more or less ceas-

at the same time far from committing itself to an unmitigated *dvaita* or *bedavāda*—that the soul is in its nature quite different from God, the all-pervading spiritual principle of the universe. As between Saiva-Siddhānta and the school of Rāmānuja, there is substantial agreement on this question of the relation between God and the soul, nay, on almost all the important problems of philosophy. In both systems, for instance, God is necessarily 'personal,' and His grace is indispensable for all souls, whether in bondage or in salvation. In the following pages it is proposed to consider in particular the *visishta-advaita* system of Saiva Siddhānta.

Siddhānta means the End or the Truth. Saiva Siddhānta is the conclusion or final statement of all Saiva speculations. It is the conclusion reached by a refutation of all alien systems of thought. It asserts itself not only against other Hindu systems but even against other forms of thought within the folds of Saivam. It claims to be the only true and adequate *version* of the sacred scriptures while all the other systems are partly or wholly *perversions* of them. It is called therefore Vedānta Siddhānta or Vaidika Saiva. Further, as against the *advaita* school of Sankara, it has been called above *visishta-advaita*. But the name *advaita* is itself a disputed point. Saiva Siddhānta refers to the school of Sankara not as *advaita* but only as *māyā-vāda* or theory of illusion, while it prefers to call itself *suddha-advaita* Saiva Siddhānta or Siva-*advaita* Siddhānta, offering an interpretation of the word *advaita* quite different from that of Sankara himself. In fact, the meaning of *advaita*, it will be seen, forms the central topic of the whole system.

In common with all the other Hindu schools of thought Saiva Siddhānta claims to be based upon the authority of Vedas and Upanishads. Sacrifice, the main institution of Vedic times is also the main thought of the Siddhānta system; thoroughly spiritualised therein it appears under the form of self-sacrifice. The very terms of Vedic sacrifice: namely, *Pati* or *Medapati*, God of sacrifices, *pasu* the animal sacrificed, and *pāsa* the rope with which the animal is tied to the sacrificial stake—are all retained in the Siddhānta system: *Pati* meaning the one Lord, Siva; *pasu* the souls; and *pāsa* their bond or fetter. The specific thought of

the system, however, is found only in Svetāsvatara-upanishad and Saiva Āgamas. These Āgamas (Revelations) are said to be twenty-eight in number, but only a few of them like *Kāmika* and some fragments of other Āgamas are extant. They are probably 'not later in point of time than the first Buddhist council" (*Siddhānta Dīpika*, Vol. X, p. 476; also pp. 188-122; by editor, V.V. Ramanan, F.Z.S.&c.) They are said to contain the essence of all Vedic teaching; at any rate they form an important systematic exposition of philosophic thought based on the Vedas. Sri Nīlakanta Sivāchārya, in his Bhāshya to Brahma Sutras, says: "we see no difference between Veda and Sivāgama" (*vide* also *Tirumantram* 276 and *Sivagnānasiddhi* II. viii 15.) It is mostly out of these Āgamas that Saiva Siddhānta in its modern Tamil form has been formulated.

Historical research has recently led to the recognition of a northern as well as a southern school of Āgama thought (Dr. L. D. Barnett in a recent lecture delivered in the rooms of the Royal Asiatic Society of London). In the south the system has developed largely through the medium of Tamil. Tirumūlar's *Tirumantram* is an elaborate work of considerable antiquity dealing systematically with Āgama thought. The names of the sixty-three nāyanmārs or Saiva saints are all connected with the history not directly of Saiva thought but of Saiva religion in South India. Some of these nāyanmārs were great religious reformers who combated and put an end to Bouddha and Samana movements in the land. There were four recognised leaders among them, namely, (1) Manikka-vachakar, the author of *Tiru-vachakam*, who was probably the oldest of them; (2) Appar who was miraculously reconverted to Saivam from Samana and lived as an elder contemporary of (3) Sambandar, considered the greatest of them all, belonging probably to the seventh century A. D.; and lastly (4) Sundarar who lived later on somewhere between the seventh and the ninth centuries A.D. The names of Appar and Sambandar are particularly connected with a victory of Saivam over Bouddham and Jainam. The devotional hymns of Appar, Sambandar, and Sundarar form the collection known as *Tevāram*. This compilation and *Tiruvachakam* form the common prayer book of most Saiva households and are revered and known as Tamil Vedas. The history of Saiva

thought, however, till about the twelfth century A.D., is not easily traceable except through scattered works like *Gnānāmrutam.* Subsequently, in the general renaissance movement of the time, Vaishnavam under the lead of Rāmānuja come to be definitely marked off from and even opposed to Saivam; and a stimulus was given to the systematic reformulation of Saiva thought in the shape of the Tamil Siddhānta sāstras.

These sāstras are fourteen in number, and are of unequal compass and importance. *Sivagnāna-bodam*, the main document of the Siddhānta school, is the work of Mei-kanda-sivāchārya. (This name means "one who has found out the Truth, the truth of *advaita*" as Tayumānavar says.) The twelve sūtras, of which it is an elaboration, are said directly to form a part of *Rouraya Āgama* in Sanskrit. The next great teacher, Arul-nandi Sivāchārya, was evidently a profound scholar versed in Sanskrit as well as in Tamil (known as Sakala āgama-pandita). His work *Sivagnānāsiddhi* is the best and the most elaborate work on the subject, and is in the form of a powerful commentary on *Sivagnānabodam.* The next teacher, Marai-gnāna-sambandar, seems to have left no written treatise behind him. Umāpati Sivāchārya, fourth and last of the Siddhānta school of teachers, is the author of eight works on the subject, the chief of which are *Sivaprakāsam, Tiru-arul-payan,* and *Sankalpa-nira-karanam.* The approximate time of these teachers and their works may be determined by the fact that 1235 Sakha era (=1313 A.D.) is the date assigned to *Sankalpa-nira-karanam* in the preface (stanza 2) to that work by its author Umāpati-sivāchārya. Of the commentaries on these works *Drāvida Mahābhāshyam* by Sivagnānaswami is a valuable and exhaustive treatise on *Sivagnānabodam.* There are as many as six different commentators on *Sivagnānasiddhi.* A number of mutts in the land, like the one at Tiru-āvadu-turai, developed into centres of learning, and the order of mendicants in them has given rise to able Siddhānta scholars. The Siddhānta sāstras thus have come down to us in a highly complex and developed form.

The intrinsic importance of the system, it is hoped, will become apparent in the course of the study. Further, it is only this one school of thought that finds a systematic expression in Tamil. Thirdly, the *advaita* school of Sankara has

unduly tended in the minds of Western people either to be considered the whole of Hindu thought or, under the influence of Thibaut and other students of the school of Rāmānuja, to be distinguished only from Vaishnava *visishta-advaita* and not from Saiva Siddhānta thought. It is true that a Smārta or follower of *advaita* is also a worshipper of Siva but only as one manifestation of the Supreme Being, whereas Saiva thought is the recognition of Siva alone as the Supreme Deity. Saivam and Saiva Siddhānta should thus be carefully contrasted with *advaita* or the school of Sankara. Lastly, there is a newly-awakened interest in the system not only among the followers of Siddhānta but among Christian missionaries in the land. The works of authoritative writers on the subject are being translated into English. One or two journals like the Siddhānta Dipika have been working for the past so many years. Says Rev. W. Goudie in the *Christian College Magazine* (Vol. II, No. 9): "There is indeed in many of the root elements of this system such an approach to Christian forms of thought, and more particularly to phases of Christian experience, that the unbiassed student can hardly escape the conviction that the Spirit of God who has wrought mightily in us and in our fathers wrought also in the heart of the authors of this system." It will not be amiss in such a connection to deal with some of the characteristic thoughts of the Siddhānta system. The main positions, at least, of this school are of living interest to all thinkers.

Saiva Siddhānta is partly scholastic and *a priori* in method since it is based on certain sacred scriptures, that is, on authority. The scriptures form God's message or revelation unto us. The satisfactoriness of our interpretation of the message is, however, far from evident unless and until such interpretation covers all facts of 'perception' and 'inference.' Alongside the 'word of authority,' 'perception' and 'inference' are also recognised mediums of knowledge; and, when their evidence is in conflict with the 'word of authority,' one can not be sure of having quite understood either the 'word of authority,' or the facts of 'perception' and 'inference.' Recognising the essentially tentative and progressive character of our knowledge Saiva Siddhānta not only attempts to learn from the Scriptures but also seeks to gather the facts of 'perception' and 'inference.'

It analyses the facts of experience and attempts to formulate a coherent account of life. By a critical analysis of experience it seeks to determine the factors indispensable for a satisfactory account of life. In all arguments moreover it appeals to plain undeniable facts of experience. The method of Siddhānta is therefore partly also scientific and *a posteriori*.

Three other points may also be noted in connection with the method of the school. At every stage in the discussion of a problem, diverse objections are raised and refuted. Subtle analysis of the implications of conceptions is also a characteristic trait of the school. Despite the fact that analogical arguments are particularly liable to fallacies, Saiva Siddhānta is expert in detecting and exposing false analogies and felicitous in the choice of most approximate and effective ones.

The fundamental metaphysical postulates of the Siddhānta system may now be considered. There are three of them, viz., *Pati* or Lord, *pasu* or soul, and *pāsa* or bond, the bond being of three main varieties, *ānava*, *karma*, and *māya*. All these factors are necessary for a satisfactory account of the facts of life. Let us take each of these in turn.

The argument for God rests on the nature of the universe. The universe of men and things, it is said, is liable to manifestation and reduction, that is, has a causal or rudimentary and an effectual or manifested form. That the universe in its present form is an effect is indicated by the fact that all objects in it have had a beginning and are liable to an end, that is, are of a derivative, dependent, and transient nature. Not only all inanimate and animate bodies but even conscious lives are subject to temporary manifestation and disappearance. The manifestation or coming into view is 'creation,' the temporary persistence or continuance of the manifested form is 'maintenance,' and the disappearance or reduction to causal form is 'destruction.' It is just for these transformations that God is postulated: they are wrought by God as *nimitta-kārana* or 'personal' cause upon *māya*, the primordial substratum of the manifested universe, as *upādāna-kārana* or 'material' cause. It is like the potter moulding destructible vessels out of earth. God, the cause of all transformative activity in the universe, is Himself necessarily beyond all such transformations.

In the course of the argument certain objections are also considered. If it be said that only this or that part and not the whole of the universe has ever been found to be reducible or 'destructible', it is pointed out that the whole is of the same compound and contingent nature as this or that part. (*Sivagnāna Siddhi* II. i. 9.) Another objection is that both manifestation and disappearance may be said to be *natural*; but, as Arul-nandi Sivāchārya points out (*Sivagnāna Siddhi* II. i. 3.), "if everything is natural, no deed, no transformative activity is possible; if, on the other hand, something is done, it cannot be said to be natural," meaning thereby that it has no cause. Calling an event natural, in other words, does not absolve one from the necessity of finding out a cause for it. But, granted the world must have a cause, a third objection is why may not the cause be the five elementals (*bhūtas*) or the atoms (*anus*)? This, however, will not do for two reasons: (1) The five elementals as well as the atoms cannot be *upadānā-kārana* because of their diversity and plurality and their consequent mutability—very unlike *māya* which is something irreducible, unitary, pervasive and eternal. (2) Nor can they be *nimitta-kārana* for the additional reason that they are *achit* or non-spiritual whereas no deed can be really done unless by a *chit* or spiritual being (*Sivagnāna-Siddhi* II. i. 11, 12, 13 and 3). Lastly, the objection is raised that *māya* by itself may be quite a sufficient cause of the universe. This is, however, untenable because it is contrary to experience that an *upādāna-kārana* may give rise to an effect without the help of a *nimitta-kārana*. Moreover, the universe is evidently the work of a *chit* or spiritual being, because the manifested universe by providing "bodies, senses, spheres and enjoyment" evokes conscious life (*Sivagnāna-siddhi* II. i. 17).

Now this is mainly an argument from the contingent objects of experience, known as the cosmological argument. Contingent objects exist, and they are not self-caused, nor can they be explained by a *regressus ad infinitum*. A first cause is thus postulated, which is independently existent and far from sharing in the contingence of the objects themselves. The existence of such a necessary Being is not made to depend on that of the contingent; in other words, God's reality is not dependent on

that of the universe. The universe, on the other hand, is only an indication of God, it has only a dependent reality. On account of its contingent and dependent character, the universe is called *asat*. This word *asat*, according to Siddhānta, does not mean the non-existent or fictitious but only the transient or the contingent. What reality or value it has is all due to its dependence on God. He is the enduring Reality or *Sat* which the universe fails to show. The realm of contingent objects points beyond itself to God just because He is what it is not.

The cosmological argument is not the only one used in this connection. God, therefore, is not left as the mere Infinite describable only in negative terms. The Siddhānta argument for God is partly also an argument from design and purpose. If it were not for God's intelligent adaptation, how is the progressive unfolding of conscious life possible? The comprehensive fact that our "bodies, senses, spheres and enjoyments" are adapted to call forth and develop our inherent capacities is unmistakable evidence of design which leads to the Designer or Architect. God is thus recognised to be an intelligent (*chit*) being designing or adapting certain means to an end. (*Sivagnāna Siddhi* II, i, 17). Secondly, how could there be any intelligible meaning, purpose or goal in the universe except as it is guaranteed by God? In most affairs of life the presence of purpose can be clearly traced. Being ourselves intelligent or *chit* beings, we seek for certain ends or goals of action. Of life as a whole there must be a purpose or goal without which it would be fundamentally unintelligible. That purpose, according to Siddhānta, is evidently the perfection or fulness of life, liberation from all that fetters life,—misery, ignorance and wickedness. Such a goal, if it is to be anything more than a bare possibility, must be substantiated and vitalised by God Himself. He must co-operate with us and lead us to the goal. The world-purpose must be His purpose. Moreover, on the analogy of our own purposeful activity, it must be said that God's activity as 'personal' cause of the universe cannot be without a purpose. It is contended, no doubt, that He cannot have any unrealised purpose of His own, for He is the Perfect Being having all good in Himself. His deeds, nevertheless, cannot be aimless "like those of idiots." He is full of compassion for the souls in bondage and aims at

their salvation in all His deeds. Thus again God is *chit* or spirit, that is, an intelligent purposeful being.

One drawback of a design-argument is the recognition of a material for God's designs, which is apparently external to Himself. Saiva Siddhānta is particularly liable to this charge, since it requires *māya*, a material cause, which manifests itself as the universe when God exerts His energy upon it. According to certain other schools God is the all-sufficient cause of the universe, *upādana* as well as *nimitta*. Sri Nīlakanta, for instance, in his Bhashya to Brahma sutras, is an adherent of this view. The law of parsimony of causes, it is said, necessitates making God the sole cause since it would be limiting His infinity and absolute freedom to believe that He needs a material for creation. This position is usually illustrated by the analogy of the spider which makes its web all out of itself. To this view, however, there are objections. How can *chit* or spirit by itself bring about the world of *achit* or non-spiritual objects? How can *sat* by itself be the cause of *asat*? How can the Perfect out of itself evolve the imperfect, ignorant and sinful universe? In a word, how can God by Himself, it is asked, constitute a satisfactory account of the universe? It is, moreover, contrary to experience that a *nimitta-kārana* can at the same time be also an *upādāna-kārana;* and the analogy of the spider is faulty because the spider as doer cannot be simply identified with the spider's body which is the 'material' cause of the web. There is thus the necessity for *māya*, an *achit* and *asat* principle for the universe, not as external to and as a check upon God but as entirely subservient to Him, an instrument in His hands, perfectly amenable and pliable to His designs and purposes. Though said to be eternal, *māya* is admittedly *asat*, and "no *asat* can stand before *sat*" (*Sivagnānabodam* vii). In one place *māya* is even said to be a form of God's *sakti* or potence (*Sivagnānasiddhi* II. ii, 53). If all these statements are put together, God's freedom and omnipotence, it will be seen, are in no way compromised by His using a thoroughly plastic material for purposes of 'creation,' etc. (*Sivaprakasam* 11).

It will now be seen how the nature of God is largely involved in the above argument for God. He is no characterless colourless Being, not the essence of indetermination. He is fundamentally *sat* and *chit*: as *Sat* He is immutably real and the

cause of all activity in the universe, and as *Chit* He intelligently purposes to evoke and perfect conscious lives. Though He is called *nirguna*, this does not mean devoid of *all* attributes but only of all gross impure qualities subject to change and decay, namely, *satva, rajas* and *tamas*. He possesses all gracious attributes and is called *ashta-guna-murti* or 'Lord of eight attributes.'

Nor is God simply a cold intellectual Being. His being *Chit* involves not only intelligence (*gnāna*), but love (*ichcha*) and activity (*kriya*). Every *chit* is a trinity in unity: knowing, loving, and doing are the three essential aspects of the life of every *chit* or spiritual being. It is particularly noted that knowledge by itself is an abstraction. "Wherever knowledge is present, love and activity are also invariably present" (*Sivagnānasiddhi* II. i. 62). This is one of the most significant and welcome points of the Siddhānta system and bases the religion on love between spiritual beings. God is the Friend of all the countless lives or *chit* beings in the universe. He loves them all, knows all their needs, and helps them, by 'creation' and other deeds, gradually to overcome all the obstacles to their freedom (*Sivagnānasiddhi* II. i. 63). The very essence of Him is love. "The ignorant think that love and Sivam are two, none know that love is identical with Sivam" (*Tirumantram* 158). "Without grace there is no Sivam" (*Sivagnānasiddhi* II. v. 9; *vide* also *Sivagnānabodam* v. b. 3). It is also significant that in Saiva devotional works Siva is frequently called 'hill of grace' or the 'sea of grace.'

God's love for the countless souls is manifested in all His 'five deeds,'—'creation,' 'protection,' 'destruction,' 'obscuration,' and 'deliverance.' The first four of these are only preparatory for the last,—'deliverance.' 'Creation' and 'protection' mean respectively the endowment and maintenance of the "bodies, senses, worlds and enjoyment"—means by which the souls are enabled to develop themselves. By 'destruction' is meant the removal of such means in order to rest the souls for a time. 'Obscuration' is the toleration of the worldly dispensation until the souls are ripe enough for deliverance or liberation from all bondage (*Sivagnānasiddhi* II. i. 37). The rhythmic succession of 'creation,' 'protection' and 'destruction' should not be understood in any way to be incompatible with the incomparably

more important under-current of continuous development which culminates in deliverance.

God's love for the souls is as spontaneous and unlaboured as child-play and parental love. It is in order to indicate such spontaneity or absence of effort, and not the absence of purpose, that God's activities are called "Divine sports" (*Sivaprakasam* 6). It is true that in Saiva thought Divine love does not come to us in that superlatively tragic form which it assumes in Christ. Yet it is practically the same truth which is brought out in connection with Siva's name Nīla-kanta (= black-throated). The story goes how all the gods or superhuman souls sought to obtain the *amrata* that would render them immortal, how in their attempt to get this 'elixir of life' they found themselves confronted with a fiery poison, and how Siva volunteered to eat the poison Himself and so enabled them to secure immortality. Hence, says Manikka-vachakar most pathetically: "Thou mad'st me Thine, didst fiery poison eat, pitying poor souls, that I might Thine ambrosia taste—I, meanest one."

God is more than Love. He is verily the Life of all lives, that is, the guarantee of all life in the universe. Gradually He removes the connatural obstacles to the lives of souls and enables them progressively to share in His life. This fundamental conviction that He is the Life of all lives means in detail that there is no possibility of any knowledge, desire or activity in the universe apart from His co-operation. There are germs of knowledge, desire and activity in the universe no doubt with His co-operation, but these again are far from ultimately satisfying. In other words, Truth, Love and Goodness are not in the actual possession of the universe; they are only ideals to us, the one eternal home of them all being God Himself. He it is by an absolute dependence on whom all souls can realise their own lives.

God's 'eight attributes' are an elaboration of His fundamental character so far sketched. He is (1) *all-knowing*, (2) *all-powerful*, and (3) *all-pervading*, since He has directly to co-operate with the countless souls whose desires, knowledge and activities do not tally with one another. "He pervades all souls as the vowel 'a' pervades all syllables" (*Sivagnānasiddhi* II. ii. 2; *vide* also *Tiru-arul-payan* i. 1). Other attributes are: (4) *boundless grace* towards all souls. His name is Sankaran, 'One who

does the highest good to the souls' (*Tiru-arul-payan* i. 9); (5) *absolute freedom* from all limitations and shortcomings; (6) *eternal enlightenment*, since otherwise He should Himself be dependent on some one else for His enlightenment; (7) *spotless being* since otherwise He could not wean the souls altogether out of sinfulness and impurity; and lastly (8) *infinite bliss*, since if He had it not He could not give it to us. These attributes give us a very positive and determinate conception of Him.

By calling God a *chit* or spiritual being was meant above His possession not only of intelligence but of love and activity; and this is precisely the sense in which God, as well as the souls, may be said to be 'personal.' His relation to the countless souls who are also *chit*-beings is necessarily a 'personal' relation, the souls themselves being co-eternal with God Himself. It is on account of such 'personal' relation that God is most frequently called Father and Mother of all the souls in the universe.

Ichcha sakti, Gnana sakti and *Kriya sakti* are the names respectively of God's love for the souls, knowledge of their needs and activity in 'creation' and other deeds. *Parā sakti*, or simply *Sakti*, is the generic name for all the aspects of God's life in relation to the souls. Sakti stands to Siva as light to sun. It is through His *Sakti* of many forms that Siva reveals Himself to us. Siva and Sakti together pervade and animate the whole universe. In more concrete terms, it is usual to say Siva is the Father and Sakti the Mother of all the created realms. There is, at this point, a tendency to branch off into religion and poetry and end practically by recognising two 'Persons' in one Supreme Being. One other subtlety may be noted. In spite of Siva and Sakti being the father and the mother of all the world, Siva is a bachelor and Sakti a maid (*Sivagnānasiddhi* II. ii. 77). This means that God, with all His boundless love for the world, does not thereby distort Himself, get worried, and lose His perfection in any way.

In the sense of a gross material embodiment, Siva has certainly no form. He cannot have a body like ourselves, for our bodies are given to us and we are largely dependent on them. Nor can it be said that He has no form at all, for that would mean inability on His part to take on any form (*Sivagnāna-siddhi* II. i. 43). "What forms He will take and what not, we

cannot say" (*Sivagnānasiddhi* II. i. 44). He is all-knowing and all-powerful, and can take on the form He chooses without let or hindrance (*ibid.* II. i. 45). He knows our wants as well as our limited capacities. "If he did not out of His grace assume forms, nobody could give out Vedas and Āgamas, nobody could impart instruction in the form of Guru or spiritual teacher to the gods, men, and residents of the nether regions, and so nobody could secure salvation" (*Sivagnānasiddhi* II. i. 46; *vide* also *Sivagnānabodam* VIII. b. 3). For purposes of 'creation,' etc., He takes on the form of Brahma, Vishnu and others (*Sivagnānasiddhi* II. i. 51) and "He accepts worship both in inanimate forms mainly in the form of Siva linga, and in living forms" mainly in the form of Saiva devotees (*Sivagnānasiddhi* II. ii. 28; *vide* also *Sivagnānabodam* XII. c). Siva's forms vary therefore according to the varying needs of the infinite number of souls under His care.

How does God stand in relation to the universe? He is certainly immanent in it, for without His immediate presence and incessant co-operation there can be absolutely no life in it (*Sivagnānabodam* ii. d; *Tiru-arul-payan* i. 1 and 8; *Irupa-irupahdu* 2). "Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet." But at the same time, He transcends the whole of creation and is not comprehended by it. He is nowhere in Siddhānta declared to be identical with the universe. In other words, the system is not Pantheistic in the usual sense of the word. It says: "He is all the world and yet different from it all" (*Sivagnānasiddhi* II. ii. 1), thus recognising His transcendence as well as His immanence. Probably a better term than Pantheism would be Pan-en-theism—employed in W. R. Inge's *Christian Mysticism*—a term which expresses the absolutely dependent reality of the universe on God who creates, pervades and sustains it every moment of its life.

Both immanence and transcendence are brought out in the Siddhanta sastras by saying that God stands in an *advaita* relation—a relation of one-ness or non-duality—with the whole universe. It is helpful, in illustrating the nature of *advaita* relation, to point out also two other instances of it, namely, (1) the relation of soul and body, (2) the relation of vowel and consonant. The soul is immanent in the body and yet transcends it. The soul cannot be identified with the body, but the body is the seat, or medium

of manifestation, of the soul. The soul may identify itself at times with the body, but the one is not and cannot be the same as the other. Such a relation of one-ness between two different things is *advaita* relation. Similarly in the other instance. It is only with the help of the vowel that the consonant sounds, but the one is not identical with the other. Moreover, of the two related terms in each of these instances the former, that is, the soul or the vowel, is quite capable of standing without the latter, but the latter, that is, the body or the consonant, is totally dependent on the former and cannot stand by itself. This is *advaita* relation. Such a relation holds between God and the universe. The universe is His body, He the soul of it. He can stand independently of the universe, but not the universe independently of Him. The universe has life in it just because God is in an *advaita* relation with it. God is the life-giving principle in the universe but not identical with it. It should now be tolerably clear that the Siddhānta school does not deny the reality of either of the related terms, God and the universe, but only says that God is *at one* with the universe, that is, in an *advaita* or non-dual relation with it.

The manifested universe of "he, she and it" is no doubt an effect wrought out of *māya* by God's *sakti*; but it should be carefully noted that *māya* can only account for the manifestation and disappearance of the lives of souls and really presupposes an eternal world of souls capable of such manifestation and disappearance. The *Pati* or Lord is directly interested only in this universe of *pasu*'s or souls for whose sake He does all the 'fine deeds' of 'creation,' etc. The *pasu*'s belong to the same category as the *Pati* Himself,—the category of *chit* or spiritual beings. These souls, countless in number, form the object of love for the Lord. He is called *Pasu-pati* or Lord of souls. The next problem thus is a consideration of the nature of the *pasu* or soul, another of the metaphysical postulates of the system, and this will be taken up in a subsequent article.

A. RAGHAVA AIYAR.

NOTES OF THE MONTH.

MUCH misapprehension prevails as to the extent to which Secondary and University education in India is self-supporting, and also as

to the extent to which it is reasonable to expect it to be so. That higher education when placed on a popular basis should forthwith become wholly self-supporting is an altogether fallacious contention. In no country in the world is it the case that the fees paid by students meet the entire expenditure incurred in providing the facilities for education that they enjoy, and it is difficult to understand why any one should expect India to be an exception to the rule. There are of course institutions in which both tuition fees are high and the cost of residence,—board and lodging,—is great; but these institutions are intended to be select, and the expense of the education received in them keeps them so, and enables them either to be entirely self-supporting, or even to be worked to a handsome profit. The so-called Public Schools of England are institutions of this character. The nearest analogue to these to be found in India is the colleges established for the education and training of young princes and wealthy Zemindars: but no one would seriously contend that education should be confined to these classes in India, or to the correspondingly wealthy classes in other countries.

IT is not easy to arrive at a standard whereby it may be determined whether the fees paid by students are either too high or too low: and yet so long as the state subsidises higher education the problem cannot be set aside. No satisfactory result can be reached by simply placing the tuition fees paid by Indian students over against those paid at Oxford or at Cambridge, or, say, at any of the Scottish Universities. The value of money is relative, not absolute, and in this case relative to what it may cost a student to live while he is receiving his education at one of these Universities, or at a College of an Indian University: and no one will deny that the expenses for board and lodging incurred by a student going through his course at an Indian College are very much less than those incurred by a student in any western country. It would give a tolerably fair standard for the rate of tuition fees that ought to be imposed in India if the proportion that these fees ought to form of a student's total expenses could be determined. For example, suppose that board and lodging, books, and petty expenses cost a student Rs. 200 a year, and that tuition fees for the same period come to Rs. 100, then the latter would form one-third of his total expenses. Is this a fair proportion, or how does this proportion compare with what prevails elsewhere in the world?

ANOTHER way whereby the rate of fees in our Indian Colleges may be standardised is to ascertain such actuals as the total cost of the teaching staff and the proportion of this that is met by the tuition

In fact, an instance of it is to be found. The qualification with regard to private management has been introduced advisedly; for, granting the number of professors and other teachers to be the same, and the number of students to be also the same, in a Government College the proportion of cost met by fees is bound to be much less;—and for the obvious reason that in a Government College salaries are very much higher, while provision has also to be made for pensions. In these circumstances it is but reasonable to look to Government to demand of students in a Government College substantially higher fees than those which students in a College under private management may be required to pay. This contention ought to become practically imperative when regard is paid to a further consideration, to be referred to presently.

THE writer in the *Quarterly* reminds us that Oxford has 'ancient endowments' and that at least one-third of the salaries of the tutors is paid out of the income drawn from them. It is the absence of any such provision for education that is conspicuous in most of our Indian Colleges, and is specially so in the Universities as such. It may quite fairly be pleaded that the Universities and Colleges in India have not had time yet to attract to themselves anything of the nature of substantial endowment, but more, even already, might have been done in this direction, had there been a truer appreciation of the cost at which alone a good education can be provided, combined with a better informed desire to spread the benefits of higher education. What is sometimes called the 'net cost' of an Indian College, that is, the balance of the cost not met by fees, is in the case of an institution under private management met by a grant from Government, and by income, if the institution is fortunate enough to command such, from endowments or from annual subscriptions. In no College in South India, so far as we know, is there a professorial chair or a lectureship which is even partially endowed. One or two of the Colleges have endowments which are available for general purposes, or for scholarships and prizes; but in the case of the Missionary Colleges, for example, subscriptions received from outside India are necessary to make up the balance of the cost of the teaching staff and to meet the cost of plant, of equipment, and of maintenance generally. The case, however, of Government Colleges, in which expenses are, as has already been stated, much heavier, is the same as that of the poorest College in the University, for the total of the net cost and all other expenses have to be made good by drawing upon public funds. These Colleges have neither endowments nor subscriptions for general purposes, nor yet for special teaching purposes. Government, seemingly oblivious

of this fact, have in the past shown a strong tendency to reduce the grants made in aid of institutions which from fees and from the other sources referred to appear to be in a flourishing condition, while at the same time most inconsistently they tend to increase the expenditure in their own colleges. Besides, while exempting their own colleges from any condition of the kind, they incline more and more to require private institutions to meet a greater part of their net cost from private sources. What is still more reprehensible, they make no attempt to secure by a high rate of fees that the fee income in their own colleges will bear some reasonable proportion of the cost of maintaining the teaching staff. Indeed recent experience would seem to justify the assertion that the Madras Government have resolved to compete directly with Aided Colleges by adopting a method that is closely akin to underselling. They offer an article at a price that bears no proper relation to the cost of supplying it, and this they do by keeping the rate of fees in Government Colleges a mere trifle above that required of Colleges under private management,—that is, if these latter would become eligible for a grant,—and by employing a teaching staff at once numerous and expensive. Public funds are thus freely used much in the same way as a great American Trust uses its capital to oust the small supplier from the field, while a Grant-in-aid Code, which professes to offer help, lays down conditions which take away with one hand what has been offered with the other. The new Fee Regulations that come into operation in July are the most ominous sign of the intentions of the Madras Government that has appeared for many years. A useful interpellation for the Legislative Council would be the question,—Will Government be pleased to state the proportion of the cost of maintaining the teaching staff of the Government Colleges that is met by the fees of the students?

THERE can be no doubt that the Hon'ble Mr. Bhupendra Nath Basu's Civil Marriage Bill has been received throughout educated India with the deepest interest. It is certainly a marked sign of advance, and is another proof that the age-long conservatism of this great land is slowly but inevitably yielding to influences from without. It is true that it has not by any means received unanimous approval; we should have been surprised if such had been the case, but it has been welcomed not only by the definite party of Social Reform, but by many who give but a half-hearted adherence to the tenets of this particular school of thought. Briefly the object of the Bill is (we quote from Mr. S. Srinivasa Aiyangar's exposition of it in the *Indian Review*) "to enable Hindus belonging to different castes to intermarry, and to

make inter-marriages between various sub-castes valid beyond the possibility of doubt or dispute. As the Bill stands at present it will enable Hindus to intermarry with Europeans, Mahommedans, Christians, Jews, Parsis, Buddhists, Sikhs, 'in short, persons of every community, race, or creed... It will also enable persons who can validly marry according to Hindu law to dispense, if they choose, with the customary rites or ceremonies and to avoid all the incidental expense, and to contract a purely civil marriage with all the incidents of such marriage as provided in Act III of 1872." Should the Bill become law it will give perfect freedom of inter-marriage. It does not in any sense annul the present system of marriage; it simply grants permission to those who object to the present restraints, to contract a valid and legal marriage, where at present it is forbidden by Hindu Law, as currently administered in the courts. We do not suppose that even if the Bill becomes law in its present shape it will have any very wide immediate effect. Custom and tradition will hold India in thrall for many a day. But there can be absolutely no doubt that as the years go by it will be ever increasingly taken advantage of and will prove a powerful instrument in breaking down the barriers that separate class from class in India.

THE fourth general census of India was taken on the night of 10th March, 1911, and was surely a marvel of organization. Within nine days of that date the Government was able to announce that the total population of India was 315,001,009. The net increase during the ten years was about twenty millions, or about seven per cent. The Governor General in Council desires to acknowledge the services of the census staff, numbering about two millions. Only the most careful and elaborate thought and planning could have achieved a task so stupendous in such an incredibly short time. The quietness with which it was accomplished was as conspicuous as its rapidity, and it shows that the ignorant dread of the census enumerator is already ceasing to be a serious factor in the situation. The details are being eagerly awaited.

THE retirement of Sir Robert Hart from the post of Inspector-General of Maritime Customs in China is an event of world-wide significance. It has been given to few men to wield so wide an influence, and to use that influence for the highest good of the community and the nation in which he lived. He is now a man of seventy-six years of age, and he spent forty-eight of these years in the Chinese service. He obtained leave of absence three years ago for

one year, and this was extended year by year until he has been absent from China three years in all and now he has offered his resignation. *The Times*, speaking of his great career, says "he has lived a life for which we know no parallel. It is of course nothing new for Europeans to serve Oriental Governments, and to serve them with distinction. But the Europeans who have held office under such governments have seldom, if ever, succeeded in profoundly modifying the administration of the states in which they lived. It is the unique distinction of Sir Robert Hart that he has accomplished this feat in the oldest, and in some respects, the most conservative empire upon earth. He has grafted on to the unwieldy and corrupt system of Chinese administration a department which is a model of efficiency and probity. His success was astonishing. He had little but his personal character to support him in his early efforts to establish the new department, and he has had great difficulties to encounter, from without as well as from within." Sir Robert's three years in his native land have been full of beneficent activity, and though he now retires from official connection with China, he is giving himself without stint to the service of the land and people he loves. His voice is heard on many a missionary platform, and his great influence has been during these years thrown consistently on the side of Christianity.

THE extraordinary development of China in recent years is the theme of every magazine and newspaper. For a time it may have been suspected that the narrative of her growth was coloured by enthusiastic advocates. If so, that day has gone by. The baldest official utterances tend to glow with impassioned fervour. The following semi-official utterance comes from Peking to *The Times*:

"Even in far western Yunnan the desire for reform and the idea of patriotism are penetrating. The disappearance of opium from the province can only be described as wonderful. Prohibition has caused less distress to the agricultural population than was generally anticipated. From the beginning the cultivators were wise enough to recognize that the officials were in earnest, and, abandoning opium, they turned their attention to the possibilities of less profitable crops—chiefly buckwheat and different varieties of beans—with encouraging results. Everywhere the soldiery are being regularly drilled on more modern methods; and, in place of the old style, slovenly dressed ruffian wearing a coat that was once red, and armed with an umbrella and an opium pipe, who formerly acted as escort to the foreign travellers in Yunnan, one now gets an alert, active individual, who carries a Mauser rifle of recent pattern, and knows more or less how to use it.

"But the change that will tell most for the good of the province is the spread of the educational movement. In the Tali and Yung-chang Prefectures many new schools have been opened, where teaching is being conducted on new principles. Formerly any dirty little cubicle served as a schoolroom, and a crowd of unkempt youngsters, presided over by an ill-paid, be-spectacled pedagogue, produced appalling discord by reciting—at the top of their voices and each in a different key—passages from the classics. Now one enters a spacious, well-lighted room, with orderly rows of desks, where sit the boys poring more or less silently over their tasks. Only five years ago a Yunnanese girl who could read was a rarity, one who could both read and write a phenomenon. Now, in every town, one or more buildings bear outside the legend in Chinese, 'Elementary School for Girls,' and any morning one may meet bevies of little maidens bound thither, clad in long, dark-blue gowns, and with their hair in neatly plaited queues. None but girls with natural feet are admitted to these schools—a sensible rule which the officials are determined to maintain, for the foot-binding custom is dying hard in Yunnan. There are two simple reasons for this. In the first place, none of the women of the hill tribes—who are regarded as savages by the Chinese—bind their feet. Again, all families with any pretensions to social rank own one or two slave girls who, strict custom—based on convenience—demands, should go bare-footed."

WE have lying before us the prospectus of the Theological Department of the Serampore College, and the prospectus of the united Theological College of South India and Ceylon. They are interesting and cheering signs of the progress of the Christian community. Perhaps the main difference between the two colleges is the power possessed by the Serampore College to grant the degree of B.D., and this power, especially in a land like India, is a great asset. Another feature of difference lies in the constitution of the council. Under the charter of Serampore only one member of the council may be a non-Baptist. The promoters of the present college have made every endeavour to avoid any sectarian flavour by their appointments to the staff, and they propose to make application to the Government of India for powers to enlarge the Council so as to admit a due representation of various evangelical bodies. No such restriction hampers the South Indian College. Both colleges seem remarkably well equipped for the work to be done. The general educational standard for admission is in both cases nominally the Intermediate examination of an Indian university, but in both colleges candidates

may be admitted who have not appeared for the Intermediate examination. In the case of the South Indian College such candidates are required to pass an entrance examination, and are not required even to be Matriculates. The real test of the colleges will come in the next few years. That they will be needed some day there is no doubt, but they may have to pass through a period of initiation. If in the course of the next five years it should be found that there is a place for both colleges, why should they not be affiliated? The Bangalore students might thus by passing the same examinations be granted the Theological degree.

LITERARY NOTICES AND NOTES.

The Growth of the Empire, a Handbook to the History of Greater Britain. By Arthur W. Jose. Revised Edition. Mr. John Murray: London. Pp. 443.

Mr. Jose's History of Greater Britain, which belongs to Mr. Murray's "Imperial Library" series, appeared originally nearly ten years ago. The fact that it has been twice re-issued, once in a cheaper form, and that now a new and revised edition has appeared shows that it has found appreciative readers.

The scope of the work may be gathered from the titles of the ten chapters into which it is divided. After an introductory chapter, which deals with the British Empire under the headings 'What is it?,' 'How did it come into being?' and 'Britons as colonizers,' Mr. Jose describes the 'Beginnings of the Empire,' 'England and France in America,' 'British Canada,' India, British India, Australasia, Africa, 'The Developing of Africa,' and 'Imperial Developments.' It is in the last three chapters that the most important differences between the old and the new editions are to be found, the last two chapters being practically entirely new, and chapter VII—the chapter on Africa—being almost entirely re-written.

In writing on the British Empire Mr. Jose has the advantage of having seen the places of which he writes. He has travelled widely and has visited most of the regions, the history of which in their connexion with Great Britain he sketches. His style is clear and lively. His readers have never any doubt as to what his opinions are and on the whole his opinions are sound. It is perhaps too much to expect that in a work of the kind minute historical accuracy is to be looked for; otherwise we should take exception to some of the statements

made with reference to the struggle between the French and the English in Southern India. As it is, Mr. Jose's work is an excellent sketch of a subject which though it receives more attention nowadays than once it did, is still too little studied by the average citizen of the British Empire. It should be added that the book contains a good index and a number of very useful maps which show the gradual expansion of the Empire in the different parts of the globe.

LITERARY NOTES

SIR WILLIAM BUTLER'S Autobiography has been received with a chorus of praise. Papers like the *Athenaeum*, the *Spectator* and the *Times* magnify the greatness of the man and the book. The *Standard* for example speaks of it as "the record of a great thinker, a brilliant soldier, a high-minded gentleman, told by himself in language which has all the charm of expression and wit which was inseparable, to those who knew him, from Sir William Butler." Sir William has at last come to his own.

SIR EDMUND COX, who has already delighted many readers by his pictures of the life and problems of the Indian Police, has now given us a volume entitled 'Police and Crime in India.' The book is a corrective of the impression that torture is prevalent, and connived at by European officials. The chief interest, however, lies in its remarkable stories, especially with regard to the manufacture of false crime.

THE *Publishers' Circular* gives in its May number a set of figures, showing England's export in books to some of the chief book-buying countries. The following table shows the value exported to a few of these in 1909 as compared with 1905.

	1905	1909
Germany	£ 77,461	£ 103,090
France	£ 72,324	£ 77,872
Japan	£ 35,201	£ 27,233
United States	£ 430,355	£ 440,355
India	£ 201,850	£ 214,965
Australia	£ 396,816	£ 461,303
Canada	£ 109,870	£ 168,826

The most interesting figure is that of Australia. The large sum as compared with the smallness of the population shows a large book-buying public. India, in view of the fact that the educated classes

form a very small percentage of the population, is evidently one of Britain's best customers, and we may be certain that in a few years she will occupy a very high position indeed.

SCIENCE NOTES.

PROFESSOR Michelson has recently investigated the nature of the metallic' colouring in birds and insects. Most objects owe their colours to light which has penetrated some distance; metals, however, are so opaque that light cannot pass through more than a small fraction of a wave-length; and as the incident light becomes less inclined to the surface, the reflected light approaches the violet. This latter phenomenon is more easily studied in the case of aniline dyes, as these are more highly coloured than the metals, of which gold and copper are the only ones not practically white. Professor Michelson has shown that in the great majority of cases, he examined of the irridescent plumage of birds, scales of butterflies, and wing-cases of beetles, not only are the simpler tests satisfied, as had already been pointed out by Dr. B. Walter, but also the more refined tests of the polariscope. The curves of phase-difference and amplitude-ratio in the reflected light for different angles of incidence for each of the spectrum colours agree very closely with those of a suitably chosen aniline dye.

IN some exceptional cases other causes are at work. In some the appearance is slightly modified by the presence of very fine hairs: in the Diamond Beetle, for instance the brilliant green colouring was shown to be due to striations on the scales of about 50,000 to the inch. These striations must be unsymmetrical, like a saw-tooth, as the light is concentrated into one spectrum. The wing-cases of the beetle *Plustiotis resplendens* are scarcely distinguishable from brass, and the effect must be due to a screw-structure of ultra-microscopic, probably molecular dimensions. Of the circularly polarised rays into which a planepolarised ray is broken up, one is almost totally reflected while there is scarcely a trace of the other. A similar phenomenon has been observed in the case of some absorbing crystals, but the difference between the absorption for the two rays is there comparatively slight.

LAST year a palæolithic cave-dwelling was discovered at St. Brelade's Bay on the South Coast of Jersey. Among the bones and implements were found nine human teeth, and on these Dr. A. Keith

contributes an interesting letter to *Nature*. In the anthropoid apes, the movement of the jaw was a crushing or cutting one, and the great canine teeth served to prevent lateral movement. Pleistocene man had acquired a different process; the canines are shorter and the important movement is a grinding lateral one. The new method demanded a new way of securing the teeth, and the roots of the teeth just found are exceedingly massive. In modern highly civilised races the improvement of food has led to the reappearance of the primate method.

It is well known that in spinning it is necessary to keep the air moist to prevent the threads from breaking; otherwise the fibres become electrified and repel one another, so that the thread spun is weak and irregular. Electrical methods have often been tried without much success, but now M. Paillet has succeeded by the use of alternating currents of very high frequency, such as are given by a Tesla coil and as are used in some of the modern methods of electro-therapy. If the method proves practicable on a commercial scale, it should be a great boon to the workers, though one wonders whether the ozone which such a discharge is likely to produce might not be found as irritating as a saturated atmosphere is depressing.

Yet another use has been found for invar, the alloy of steel and nickel made by M. C. Guillaume of Paris. Its low coefficient of expansion has brought it into use for pendulums and standard scales, and it has rendered the measurement of base-lines in surveying much simpler and more accurate process. Now it is used for the electrodes of quartz mercury-lamps, as platinum its coefficient of expansion being much higher than that of quartz, quartz would either be loose at low temperatures or break the tube at high. M. Leblanc has introduced other features also; for one, the light is an almost pure white instead of the startling green of the original lamps.

Mr. J. E. Barnard and Dr. R. T. Hewlett have attempted to solve the difficult problem of disintegrating bacteria. The method they employ is to enclose them in a sealed vessel containing steel balls which is then rapidly rotated. After the grinding process has been carried on for a sufficient time, there are practically no bacteria left that will take a stain, so it is inferred that, even if they are apparently whole, their contents must have been altered. An attempt some years ago to

accomplish the grinding of bacteria by the help of liquid air was abandoned after some surviving germs had escaped with fatal consequences to one of the experimenters.

RECENT PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW.

THE May number opens with an article entitled *The House of Lords since Bagehot's Day* by Mr. Alexander Grant, K.C. In the midst of the present constitutional crisis, Mr. Grant says, it is not without interest to speculate as to the causes which have produced it; and the consideration of the question cannot have a better starting point than Bagehot's treatise on the English Constitution. In the first edition of that work Bagehot called attention to the advantages which the House of Lords then possessed and the dangers to which it was subject, and uttered a warning against neglect of these dangers. In this connexion he said: "The danger of the House of Commons is, perhaps, that it will be reformed too rashly; the danger of the House of Lords certainly is that it may never be reformed. Nobody asks that it should be so; it is quite safe against rough destruction, but it is not safe against inward decay. It may lose its veto as the Crown has lost its veto. If most of its members neglect their duties, if all its members continue to be of one class, and that not quite the best; if its doors are shut against genius that cannot found a family, and ability which has not five thousand a year, its powers will be less year by year, and at last be gone, as so much kingly power is gone—no one knows how. It's danger is not in assassination, but atrophy; not abolition but decline."

Mr. Grant, after quoting these words, remarks that it is unnecessary to say that the warning contained in them has passed unheeded, and goes on to point out how the advantages which the House of Lords possessed have disappeared.

In issuing the second edition of his work in 1872 Bagehot indicated the change that had come over the two Houses of Parliament during the preceding seven years by saying that the aristocratic element had lost ground while the middle class element had gained. The House of Lords still represented the aristocracy and the House of Commons was mainly representative of the plutocracy. As the interests of both these classes were mainly identical, namely, to prevent or mitigate the rule of the uneducated, the two Houses could ill-afford to quarrel. Since 1872 the spread of education has raised the masses of the people to a footing of equality, or almost of equality, with those who were formerly considered their superiors, and

the House of Commons from being plutocratic has become frankly democratic. Coincident with the growth of democracy there has been a tendency on the part of the aristocracy and the plutocracy to ally themselves against what they seem to regard as their common enemy. The cleavage between the aristocracy and the democracy has been accentuated by the loss which the Liberal Party sustained when Mr. Gladstone brought forward his scheme of Home Rule, and as a result the democratic party in the House of Lords is practically a nonentity. When the democratic party was returned to the House of Commons with an overwhelming majority in 1906, the House of Lords had to determine on a line of action. Bagehot had clearly laid down in 1872 what line of action ought to be taken in such circumstances; but no one called the attention of the House to Bagehot's wise counsels, and the Lords declared war upon the Commons. To such a war, in Mr. Grant's opinion, there can be but one end. If the House had been wisely guided in 1906, as it was guided by the Duke of Wellington after the Reform Bill of 1832 and by the Marquis of Salisbury in 1892 and 1895, the conflict between democracy on the one hand and aristocracy and plutocracy on the other might have been postponed, though only for a time.

MISS E. S. STEVENS contributes an interesting article on *The Womenkind of Young Turkey*. It is an accepted axiom, the writer says, that Turkey has no native art, no native music, no native religion. The Turk, she says, is a soldier, with a soldier's virtues and failings. He has borrowed his writing, his religion, his music, his art, and his social code from the Arab and the Persian; and nowadays he borrows his dress from England, his uniforms from Germany, and his Constitution from Europe. He absorbs ideas slowly, however, and it will take him many years to become accustomed to representative Government and to adapt himself to the more liberal conception of womanhood which is being evolved. Nevertheless, there is progress even in Turkey. About fifty years ago a generation of Turks sprang up who travelled and mixed with the women of the West, and who thought that without forfeiting their seclusion their own women might be educated sufficiently to make them more fitting companions for themselves. So governesses, chiefly Frenchwomen, were imported, and as a result the homes of many Turks to-day are more or less Europeanised. To the introduction of the foreign educational element into Turkish homes is partly to be attributed the movement which has resulted in the dethronement of despotism. The feeling of unrest, the longing for liberty, which were created in the breasts of the young women found their practical outlet among the young men. The edu-

fragrant flowers of painting but for a starting point, a foundation, and even for an ideal and pattern."

IN his article on 'Foreign Affairs' Dr. Dillon deals with the German Imperial Chancellor's objection to a general limitation of armaments, and shows how the militarism of Germany has retarded the progress of the arbitration movement. He calls attention to the fact that in Germany the average politician saw in the Anglo-American Arbitration Treaty a menace to the Fatherland, and failed to see that every Government and every people might benefit indirectly from the treaty. In the latter part of his article Dr. Dillon discusses the political situation in Russia and the causes of the Ministerial crisis. M. Stolypin, he thinks, has wantonly ruined his own reputation and put an end to his usefulness.

PROFESSOR SANDAY continues his article on *The Primitive Church and the Problem of Reunion*, dealing more particularly with 'The Constitution of the Primitive Church.' He brings together a large amount of information regarding the origin of the ministry, the functions of the chief officials in the Early Church, and the growth of the idea of Apostolical succession. He quotes largely from Harnack, to whom, he says, the history of the Christian Ministry owes more, perhaps, than to any other of the older scholars. English scholars have followed Harnack's career with increasing sympathy and admiration, for they have seen in his works a gradual stripping off of the higher criticism that was fashionable in his early years and a deepening of religious interest and insight in equal proportions. Harnack, Professor Sanday says, is always living and human; he is not overweighted by his vast learning; he is imaginative without being extravagant; and his grasp of positive truth is not weakened by chilling scepticism. Reference is also made in the course of the article to the German Theologian Rudolph Sohm, and among English theologians whose opinions are discussed are Hatch, Hort, Principal Lindsay, and Dr. Vernon Bartlet.

PROFESSOR BREUL suggests, as a means of promoting friendship between England and Germany, the establishment of a British Institute in Berlin and a German Institute in London. Among other articles we may mention *Antonio Fogazarro* by Miss Dora M. Jones; *The Gardens of Chaucer and Shakespeare* by Mr. J. E. G. deMontmorency; and *The Functions of Fashion* by Mrs. Campbell Dauncey. The number concludes with the usual reviews of books and a poem entitled *World Conquerors* by Miss Mildred Huxley.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

Why halt ye? which is the title of the first article in this number is from the pen of Mr. J. A. R. Marriott. The halting suggested is between two possible ideals of colonial government which the writer thus describes in the opening paragraph: "the one looks upon a colony as a mere swarming of surplus population, carrying to distant lands the ideas and traditions, the culture and creed, the language and laws of the motherland, but not connected with it by any ties save those of affection and blood. The other regards the colonies and the motherland as part of a common governmental organism, connected the one with the other not only by bonds of kindred and sentiment, but by the forms and machinery of a constitution." It is for the latter ideal that Mr. Marriott pleads. Many circumstances have occurred during the last twenty-five years which have rendered a formal union of the colonies and the mother country not merely possible but imperative. The rapid development of communication and the consequent 'shrinkage of the world' have tended to make nearly every question of diplomacy a question for both the mother country and the colonies, and some governmental machine must be devised by which the colonies may express their views. The other circumstances to which Mr. Marriott refers are the services rendered by the colonies to the Empire in recent times of difficulty and stress, the increase of the federal spirit in each colonial group, and the periodic meetings of an imperial conference in London. The federal force which has unified Canada, Australia and South Africa must ere long find its culmination in the federation of the Empire with a common governmental organism.

In the third section of his article, Mr. Marriott suggests a scheme for the unification of the Empire and discusses it in detail. His suggestion is the creation of a Federal council composed of the representatives of the United Kingdom and of the over-sea dominions who would be selected in unequal proportions by the executives of the component states and would hold office at the pleasure of the bodies appointing them. To present constant changes of personnel, the members would act according to instructions and so vote not as individuals but as states.

The other political article in this number is by Prof. E. C. Clark on *The Duty of the Lords.* It is practically a re-statement of an article by the same writer in the *Nineteenth Century* of July 1910 on *Political Sovereignty and a Reformed Second Chamber.* Three points Professor Clark makes—first, that the House of Commons, as it stands at present, represents one class of interests exclusively—second, that the other interests are now represented by the House of Lords—third

the situation are really two—one is the indifference with which the problem has been regarded for many years by Protestant Churches and especially by the Church of England and the other the rapid advance which has been made in the field by the Roman Catholic Church. The latter must be a matter of grave concern not merely to the Anglican Church upon which the obligation of educating the community primarily rests but to the Empire itself. For, as Mr. Skipton puts it, 'The Roman Church in India is distinctly an alien church, manned and directed by French, Belgian, Italian and German clergy, with a sprinkling of Irish Roman Catholics, none of whom—and the last-named, unfortunately, least of all—can be reckoned as our friends political or otherwise.' Two things have happened recently to render the problem one of urgent importance. The Indian Church Aid Association in 1908 repeated by a large majority the declaration made twenty years earlier by Bishop Johnson at Manchester that "the key to the position of the Church in India lay in the proper education and care of the professing Christians of our own race already domiciled in the country." The other is the offer of a donation of £50,000 by 'a wealthy Nonconformist gentleman' for the benefit of non-Catholic schools in India on condition that a joint effort was made to collect the funds necessary to put the scheme on a basis of assured efficiency.

IN his article, *The Great Sugar Project*, Mr. J. Saxon Mills makes a plea for sugar cultivation in England. The figures he quotes are interesting as showing not only that England is the biggest sugar-consuming country in Europe but also that of its total imports a considerable quantity comes from Germany and Austria—countries with whom England's relations are not always of the happiest. This latter consideration, coupled with the fact that sugar has now become very nearly a necessity, makes it desirable that part, at any rate, of the quantity imported be grown on English soil. The advantages of placing some of the rural tracts in England under sugar crop are discussed at length by Mr. Mills. Apart from the general benefits of ruralising parts of a country so largely given up to industrialism as England is, he speaks of certain advantages peculiar to sugar cultivation, such as its distribution of employment regularly over the year, its beneficial effects on the general condition of agriculture on account of the need for clean land and deep ploughing, and the number of bye-products which it would set free and which might be used as cattle food.

OTHER noteworthy articles are Hilaire Belloc's *Lord Acton on the French Revolution*—a discursive criticism of Lord Acton's Lectures on

the French Revolution in which there is some very brilliant writing, and the Duchess of Marlborough's *Hostels for Women* which is a scathing report on the kind of accommodation available for women of the labouring classes in the bigger towns of England. The opening of the first Republican Parliament in Portugal, which Reuter has just announced, gives interest to an article which appears under the title *Recollections of Portugal in the Sixties* from the pen of Lady Paget. It is a pleasant sketch of life and society in the Portugal of half a century ago.

THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

THE May issue of this Review opens with an article upon *The Bagdad Railway* in which the author, Mr. Lynch, returns to the subject which had aroused the anxiety evidenced in his article of some months past. Since the appearance of the first article four new Conventions have been concluded by the Turkish Government which go far to realise the developments which this writer was so anxious to qualify. Financial provision for the construction of the line from Halif to Bagdad has been made; the right to construct a branch line round to the Mediterranean has been conferred; the Bagdad Railway Company has been empowered to construct a new port at Alexandretta, but the terms of the fourth Convention, which deals with the extension of the Railway from Bagdad to Busrah and the Persian Gulf, have not yet been published. Basing his criticism on the newspaper reports of this fourth and, in the writer's view, most important Convention, Mr. Lynch exhibits his scepticism of the so-called 'triumph' of Turkish diplomacy which it is claimed has been achieved thereby. One of the conditions, in consideration of which the Bagdad Railway Company, has consented to forego the powers conferred by the original agreement, is to the effect that the share to be given to the Germans in the new Company which is to carry a line south of Bagdad shall not be less than the share of any other country. From this the writer concludes that the new Company will not greatly differ from the Bagdad Railway Company and that as compensation is to be given to the Bagdad Railway Company, apparently by this new Company, for whatever they may be considered to have thus surrendered, there is no good ground for describing the change as a 'renunciation' on the part of the German Company.

The right to extend to the Mediterranean is described as an acquisition by the Germans of "at least a hundred years lease of what is actually one of the most important ports on the eastern seaboard of the Mediterranean with a present trade valued at three and a half million sterling annually." "The gigantic monopoly which is to

exploit Asia Minor, Syria, and Mesopotamia is extended by these Conventions to the very border of the sea." "In fact the Germans under these Conventions have obtained the fullest and undisputed control over all the machinery of transport and communication from the coast of the Mediterranean to the frontiers of Persia." Mr. Lynch grows indignant at the thought that the Turkish Parliament has not been consulted in these arrangements and states as the view of Dr. Rohrbach that "German policy in Turkey is prompted by a conception far transcending the sphere of commerce within which, for the present, it is well content to dwell. When that scattered Empire shall have been braced together by German railways and German ports, when its varied races have acquired consistency after copious applications of these mild cementing agencies with which they are so familiar in Prussia, Turkey is to be employed by Germany as an instrument against England in Egypt and India—the only instrument by which British pride and British arrogance can effectively be curbed and controlled." After quoting more moderate German opinion, Mr. Lynch goes on to argue that when the new railway is carried into Mesopotamia, the Arabs will look upon it as an instrument whereby the yoke of Constantinople is to descend upon them and then Arab revolts and Arab retaliations upon the railway suggest the probability of Germany undertaking to prevent these disturbances. This will pave the way to a German protectorate which, in the light of similar contingencies throughout the length and breadth of the country, presents a startling vision of the future.

The remainder of the article brings forward arguments calculated to persuade the Turkish statesmen that extension of the railway from Bagdad to Busrah is contrary to their interests.

ANOTHER of the more interesting contributions to the Review discusses the political situation in Russia. Mr. R. C. Long heads this article with the laconic title, *M. Stolypin, Dictator.* The epithet dictator is applied to illustrate the powers which the President of the Council of Ministers has arrogated to himself, for these powers stultify the operation of the constitutional assemblies recently created, transforming what were ostensibly legislative assemblies into consultative bodies whose views are arrogantly overridden. From any point of view the Russian political situation cannot be otherwise than depressing. Mr. Long says: "The Premier's official repudiation of the theoretical constitution is a new event of great gravity, because it establishes the restoration of the Tsar's autocracy upon a pseudo-legal basis." M. Stolypin has promulgated a bill which was rejected by the

legislative assemblies in spite of the fact that, according to the constitution, legislators had an absolute right of veto, for the Fundamental Laws declare that no new law may be issued without the approval of the council of the Empire and of the Duma of the Empire. Until March 1911 "the validity of these vital articles had never been impugned and they have not since been impugned except by the Premier." Hitherto the laws that had been issued in spite of the Duma had had a plausible legality but now even the flimsy pretexts of legal form have been abandoned and that not for the purpose of enacting a measure which would meet a political emergency but in the interests of a purely personal quarrel. As a result both the President of the Council and the President of the Duma have resigned, "the four Constitutional Duma parties drew up interpellations on the Premier's illegalities and for the first time in history a similar interpellation was introduced into the Council. In his answer given on April 14th the Premier dealt a further blow at the constitution by denying the right of the Council to put the interpellation. . . . . . . The Premier's levity deepened the general anger. He made no concealment of his surprise at what he considered a tea-cup storm." Continuing his exposition of the situation Mr. Long declares that the subsidence of the Revolution has been taken advantage of by the Ministerialists who have grown more and more reactionary and bills which had been introduced and passed in the Duma as Government measures were thrown out in the council without protest from the ministers whose earlier policy was thus being set aside. "The Premier went with the rest and abandoned and even denounced his own reforms." Mr. Long goes on to expose the intrigues and personal jealousies of the leading court politicians and leaves the reader to wonder at the mildness of the Progressives and the moderation of the Moderates. The article shows no trace of indignation or partisan temper on the part of the writer, a feature which heightens its effect and increases the depression of the reader.

MR. LANCELOT F. LAWTON contributes an article entitled *The Powers and the Far East* with the apparent intention of demonstrating the extent to which Manchuria is being reserved for the exclusive development of Japan and Russia. He maintains that the *entente* between Japan and Russia has amounted to a repudiation of the open door policy to which Japan had declared her adherence on more than one occasion. It was as the avowed champion of "equal opportunity for all" that Japan received, in the war with Russia, the moral and

financial support of England and America. The compensation which it was expected that Japan would claim was supposed to be limited to the replacement of Russian by Japanese influence in the Kwantung Peninsula and Japanese ascendancy in Corea, but, during and since the war, it became evident that Japan proposed to absorb the whole of Manchuria, was in fact by the close of the war actually in possession and this in spite of the fact that the only document defining the *status quo* in Manchuria, the treaty of Portsmouth, contained the declaration of the Japanese that they would preserve the integrity of China. Furthermore, the writer describes how it was the pressure of the Russian monopoly in Manchuria that led up to the war and that since the conclusion of peace the Railway management has passed into Japanese hands and with it the practical monopoly of commercial development and enterprise in Manchuria. Japan calls for evidence that she has departed from her obligations. Such evidence the writer proposes to furnish in this article. Mr. Lawton shows how what is called the South Manchuria Railway Company is an undertaking supervised, if not controlled, by the Japanese Government and represents a capital of twenty-two millions sterling. "The operations of the Company are exceedingly wide and varied, for not only does it administer towns and territories adjoining the railways, but it engages in mining, warehousing, shipping, harbour control, and various other productive undertakings. For its protection the state maintains, under the guise of railway guards, a not inconsiderable garrison in Manchuria In view of all these circumstances, it will be seen that any pretence as to the maintenance of Chinese sovereignty cannot be regarded as otherwise than farcical."

The protests of American and European interests that the Japanese give preferential treatment to their own commercial undertakings are met by the Japanese assertion that they are only recognising the claims of the larger traders to a reduction in charges and that the same preference would be extended to large 'combines' other than Japanese; a contention which is safeguarded by a situation such that no foreign traders are in a position to form combines approaching in magnitude the Japanese 'concerns'. Mr. Lawton then deals with other features of Japanese policy and represents the British traders as lamenting the substitution of Japanese for Russian control. Apparently the movement of interests in the Far East is leading Britain and America to support and encourage China in her endeavour to resist the aggressive development of Japan within her territory. One notable remark occurs incidentally to the effect that the completion of the Kalgan-Kiachta line will bring Pekin within $9\frac{1}{2}$ days' journey of London.

university was sure to be stunted. In concluding his address Dr. Nair suggested the formation of a University Union, which should bring together on terms of free and frank social and intellectual intercourse the students and teachers of various educational institutions in Madras.

As President of the meeting Mr. Macphail thanked Dr. Nair for his instructive and stirring address. While agreeing with Dr. Nair in the main, Mr. Macphail thought that since he came out to India in 1886 considerable advance had been made in the directions pointed out by Dr. Nair. The student of the present day had a wider outlook and deeper sympathies than his predecessor of twenty-five years ago. But there was still ample scope for improvement.

Among the many Indians who have made the coming Coronation an occasion to visit Great Britain, the action of Mr. T. Rama Krishna Pillai in crossing the *kalipani* calls for record in the pages of this Magazine. One of the founders of the College Day Association, Mr. Rama Krishna Pillai's loyalty to the College is second only to his personal attachment to Dr. Miller. An orthodox Hindu and one who would resent being called a Social Reformer, he undertakes his present voyage, not only out of motives of intellectual curiosity and civic gratitude, but inspired by the devotion of a pupil to his master. It is a scholar's pilgrimage to the abode of a Guru whose face he could not otherwise set eyes upon. Mr. Rama Krishna Pillai's visit is thus a fresh indication of the deep-seated affection with which Dr Miller is thought of in hundreds of homes in Southern India not the least distinguished for their religious orthodoxy and social conservatism.

WE desire to call attention to the following notification of the University of Madras:

"The Calendar of the Unversity for 1912 is now under preparation. That portion of Volume II of the Calendar relating to the alphabetical list of graduates is carefully revised from year to year by the University office. It is, however, presumed that the list contains the names of many deceased graduates, and that the column 'occupation' sometimes gives incorrect and insufficient information. The Registrar will be obliged to graduates and others for information to enable the office to correct the list and bring it up to date."

METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE, MADRAS.